



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/587,267	07/26/2006	Robert Hendrik Catharina Janssen	4662-218	4733
23117 7590 10/13/2009 NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22203				
EXAMINER				
SZEKELY, PETER A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1796				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/13/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/587,267

Filing Date: July 26, 2006

Appellant(s): JANSSEN, ROBERT HENDRIK CATHARINA

---

Bryan H. Davidson  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 9/8/09 appealing from the Office action mailed 4/6/09.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

5,684,071	Mogami et al.	11-1997
5,770,644	Yamamoto et al.	6-1998

JP-09-143346	Saiki et al.	6-1997
JP-11-080519	Yoshihara et al.	3-1999
JP-2003-076088	Tanaka et al.	3-2003

### **(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mogami et al. 5,684,071, Yamamoto et al. 5,770,644, Saiki et al. JP -09-143346, Yoshihara et al. JP-11-080519 or Tanaka et al. JP-2003-076088.

Mogami et al. disclose in claim 9, a (A) thermoplastic polyester, (B) 2-50% by weight of a heterocyclic compound based on the polyester, (C) 0.1-50% by weight of a compound having at least two functional group based on component (B) and (D) 0-50% by weight of a phosphorus based flame-retarder based on said polyester (A). Component (B) is identified in claim 12 as melamine cyanurate and the polyester is identified in claim 16 as polyethylene terephthalate. Column 11, line 15 shows that the polyester can be polybutylene terephthalate. 50% by weight based on the polyester means 66.66% by weight polyester and 33.33% by weight melamine cyanurate. The other two components are "other additives" which can total 0.1% by weight based on component (B). Yamamoto et al. teach 95-30 parts by weight of polyester, 5-70 parts of polyphenylene ether (other polymer), 0.05-10 parts of compatibilizing agent (which can be a phosphorus trimester according to claim 2), 2-45 parts of phosphoric ester, 0-150 parts of filler, 0.001-15 parts of anti-dripping agent (which can be a fluorine containing polymer according to claim 5), 0-45 parts of melamine cyanurate and 0-15 parts of

polystyrene in claim 1. The polyester can be polybutylene terephthalate (column 15, lines 27-30). Saiki et al. display 100 parts of polybutylene terephthalate with 1-100 parts ammonium sulfate (other additive) and 1-100 parts of melamine compound which can be melamine cyanurate (Abstract). Yoshihara et al. reveal 100 parts of modified polyalkylene terephthalate, 0-150 parts of unmodified polyalkylene terephthalate and/or polycarbonate and 0-75 parts of melamine cyanurate (Abstract). Tanaka et al. recite 60-85 weight % polyester and 15-40 weight % melamine cyanurate (Abstract). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to select melamine cyanurate from a list of equivalents in sufficient concentrations to yield a flame-retardant polyester composition.

#### **(10) Response to Argument**

Applicants' arguments filed 7/6/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Yamamoto et al. disclose up to 45 parts of melamine cyanurate to go with the 30-95 parts of polyester. A reference disclosing optional inclusion of a particular component teaches compositions that both do and do not contain that component. See *Usher-Smith Labs. v. PamLab LLC*, 75 USPQ2d 1213, 1215 (Fed. Cir. 2005). A reference is not limited to its illustrative examples or preferred embodiments. See *In re Fracalossi*, 215 USPQ 569-570 (CCPA 1982); *In re Mills*, 176 USPQ 196 (CCPA 1972); *In re Lamberti*, 192 USPQ 278, 280 (CCPA 1976); *Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Labs. Inc.*, 10 USPQ2d 1846 Fed. Cir. 1989). The 2.05 parts of phosphate in claim 1 is sufficiently close to the "less than 2 wt. %" claimed by applicants to make it obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *Titanium Metals Corp. of America v. Banner*, 227 USPQ

773 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Mogami et al. teach 2-50 wt. % heterocyclic compound (melamine cyanurate) based on the polyester. That means 66.66 wt. % polyester and 33.33 wt. % melamine cyanurate at the high end of the melamine cyanurate concentration range. In the case where the claimed ranges overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art a prima facie case of obviousness exists. See *In re Wertheim*, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976); *In re Woodruff*, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed. Cir. 1990). The claims of Mogami et al. do not require glass fibers and minimum amount of phosphorus compound claimed is zero percent. Again, references must be considered for all they disclose and must not be limited to their preferred embodiments or working examples. Tanaka et al. recite "containing 15-40 wt. % of melamine cyanurate to the whole weight" which defines the amount of polyester as 60-85 wt. %. The Abstract of Yoshihara et al. shows no additives at all. Saiki et al. display 100 parts of polyester, 1-100 parts of ammonium sulfate and 1-100 parts of melamine cyanurate. These amounts are quite specific and overlap applicants' claimed range. As far as the picking and choosing is concerned in the context of an obviousness rejection, [see *In re Arkley*, 172 USPQ 526 (CCPA 1972)] the examiner did not pick words or phrases from one prior art reference and combined it with another. All cited references contain all the claimed ingredients and the "picking and choosing" is limited to selecting the concentrations which are reading on applicants' claims.

#### **(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

Art Unit: 1796

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Peter Szekely/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796

Conferees:

/Harold Y Pyon/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796

/Christopher A. Fiorilla/

Chris Fiorilla

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1700